

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 28 and 41 are amended as discussed below. No new subject matter is introduced by the present amendments. The amendments to the claims are supported at least by paragraphs [0036] and [0037]. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, 28, 29, 31-34, and 36-42 are pending in the present case.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, 28-29, 31-34, and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first and second paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. More particularly, it is alleged that the expression “said assessment comprising a grade for the vehicular part” found in claims 1, 28 and 41 has no support in the specification.

The claims are amended to remove the word “assessment” and thereby overcome the stated rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is kindly requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, and 38-41 are rejected for not tying the method steps to another statutory class, or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, or material that is being changed in state.

Claims 1 and 41 are hereby amended to further recite a step of “automatically transmitting to an Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) a notification of the disposition”.

In light of this amendment, it is submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, and 38-41 overcome the stated rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is kindly requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 28, 29, 31, 32 and 36 are rejected as being anticipated by Joao (US2002/00116655A1). The Applicant’s response is detailed below.

Claim 28 now includes a limitation stating: “sending the electronic folder at a

remanufacturer where the grade will be used for sorting the vehicular part” which is not present in any of the cited prior art.

In view of the above, the Applicant submits that claim 28 overcome the stated rejection. Claims 29, 31-32 and 36 ultimately depend on claim 28 and hence also overcome the stated rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is kindly requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, 38 and 41 are rejected as being obvious over Joao in view of Hormozi.

Claims 1 now includes a limitation stating: “at a remanufacturer, sorting the vehicular part according to the grade” which is not present in any of the cited prior art.

Claims 41 now includes a limitation stating: “automatically transmitting to an Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) a notification of the disposition” which is not present in any of the cited prior art.

In view of the above, the Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, 38 and 41 overcome the stated rejection. Claims 2, 4-7, 9-20, and 38 ultimately depend on claim 1 and hence also overcome the stated rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is kindly requested.

In view of the above arguments and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, 28, 29, 31-34, and 36-42 are allowable. A notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

Wilfried Blum et al.

By:

/C. Marc Benoît/

C. Marc Benoît

(Reg. 50,200)

Agent of Record

Benoît & Côté, s.e.n.c.

Tel: (514) 658-4844, #210

Customer No.: 76753